(d) whether it is a fact that some individuals indulging in unauthorised mining have devasted this sanctuary; if so, by when these activities would be stopped; and

(e) whether it is a fact that in spite of Government's apathy this Lion Project has a large number of lion therein?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI KAMAL NATH): (a) The funds released by the Central Government for the development of Gir National Park and Sanctuary during VII Five Year Plan and in the last 4 years is as under:

(Rs. in lakhs)

Year	Gir Sanctuary	Gir National Park
VII-Plan	16.61	15.366
1990-91	2.93	5.05
1991-92	7.13	0.10
1992-93	0.05	..
1993-94	12.85	..

(b) The last census of lions in Gir Forests was carried out in the year 1990 and the population of lions was 284.

(c) The Central Government will continue to provide financial assistance for the development of the Gir National Park and Sanctuary. At the same time efforts are being made to identify suitable habitats for establishing an alternate population of the lions.

(d) No such report has been received.

(e) The Asiatic lion which was once distributed throughout the country, is now restricted to the Gir forests of Gujarat. As a result of conservation measures taken up by the Central and State Governments, the population of lions has grown from about 50 in 1920 to 284 in 1990.

Pollution by sugar mills in the country

10. SHRI RAHASBIHARI BARIK: Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) the name and the number of sugar units causing pollution in the country and location thereof (State-wise);

(b) the reason why anti-pollution measures have not been taken by those sugar mills;

(c) the action initiated against those mills so far; and

(d) the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI KAMAL NATH): (a) As per information provided by the State Pollution Control Boards, there are 33 sugar units in the country which are not taking necessary steps to instal adequate pollution control facilities to comply with the prescribed standards. However, the degree of pollution caused from these units may not be the same, since there are different standards for discharge into surface water and on land. For instance, the Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) limit for discharge into surface waters is 30 mg/1 while for disposal on land it is 100 mg/1. Accordingly, the level of pollution control facilities to be provided by the unit varies depending upon the receiving body of the effluents. Moreover, among these, there are some units which are complying with the

effluent standards but not the air emission standards. The State-wise details of units which are not taking measures to set up adequate pollution control facilities to comply with effluent or emission standards or both are given in the Statement (See below).

(b) The State Boards have informed that some of the units could not instal the pollution control devices since they are sick units and are not in a position to invest any amount for installation of the required pollution control devices.

(c) and (d) The action taken by the State Boards include, withdrawal of consent orders, prosecution, issuing directions giving a time-bound programme for installation of pollution control devices or ultimately issuing closure orders in case the industries are not progressing well in implementation of the time-bound pollution control programmes.

Statement

List of the sugar units which are not taking necessary measures to set up adequate Pollution Control Deices.

Andhra Pradesh

1. M/s. The Palair Co. op. Sugars Ltd., Khammam Dist.
2. M/s. N.V.R. Co-op. Sugar Ltd., Guntur Dist.
3. M/s. Chittor Co.op. Sugars Ltd., Chittor Dist.
4. M/s Nizam Sugar Factory Ltd., Metapally, Karimnagar Dist.
5. M/s Nizam Sugar Factory Ltd., Bobbili, Vizianagaram Dist.
6. M/s. Nizam Sugar Factory Ltd., Sithanagaram, Vizianagaram Dist.
7. M/s. Hanuman Co. op. Sugars Ltd., Krishna Dist.
8. M/s. S. V. Co. op. Ltd., Gajulamandyam, Tirupati.
9. M/s. West Godavari Co. op. Sugars Ltd., W.G. Dist.
10. M/s. Nizam Sugar Factory, Zahirabad. Medak Dist.
11. M/s. Nizam Sugars Ltd., Sudhanagar, Anantapur Dist.
12. M/s. Kirlompudi Sugar Ltd., Pithapuram, E.G. Dist.

Pondicherry

1. M/s. Pondicherry Co-op. Sugar Mills Ltd., Pondicherry.

Haryana

1. M|s. Shahabad Co. op. Sugar Mills Ltd., Shahabad.
2. M/s. Palwal Co. op. Sugar Mills Ltd., Palwal.
3. M/s. Bhuna Co. op. Sugar Mills, Bhuna.

Orissa

1. Ashoka Co. op. Sugar Ltd., Aska, Ganjam.

Karnataka

1. M/s. Halasidhanath SSK Niyamit, Belgaum District.
2. M/s. Hemavathi Sahakari Sakkare Karkhana Ltd., Hassan Distt.
3. M/s. Karnataka SSK Ltd., Haveri, Dharwar District.
4. M/s. Sahakari Sakkare Karkhana Niyamit, Gulbarga District.

Uttar Pradesh

1. Ms. Sravasti Kissan Sahkari Chini Mills, Nanpara, Bahraich.

Madhya Pradesh

1. M/s. Morena Mandal Sahkari Sakkar Karkhana, Dogarpur, Morena.

2. M/s. Naval Singh Ka Sahkari Sakkar Karkhana, Burhanpur.

Punjab

1. M/s. Taran Taran Co-op. Sugar Mill Ltd., Dist. Ludhiana.

2. M/s. Budhewal Co-op. Sugar Mlss Ltd., Dist Ludhiana.

3. M/s. Nakodar Co-op. Sugar Mills Ltd., Dist. Jalandhar.

Maharashtra

1. M/s. Vrideshwar SSK Ltd., Pathardi, Dist. Ahemadnagar.

2. M/s. Sant Eknath SSK Ltd., Paithan, Dist. Aurangabad.

Rajasthan

1. M/s. Keshoraipatan Sahakari Sugar Mills, Keshoraipatan.

Tamil Nadu

1. M/s. M. R. Krishnamoorty Co. operative Sugar Mills Ltd. Sethia Thoppu, South Arcot District.

2. M/s. N.P.K.R.R. Co-op. Sugar Mills Ltd., Thalainair Quaid-E-Milleth District.

3. M/s. Triuthani Co-op. Sugar Mills Ltd., Tiruvalangadu.

Amendment in Indian Forest Act, 1927

11. SHRI SARADA MOHANTY: Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have a proposal to amend the Indian Forest Act of 1927;

(b) if so, what are the changes in the offing.

(c) the salient features of the Amendment Proposed; and

(d) the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI KAMAL NATH): (a) Yes, Sir Indian Forest Act, 1927 is the principal legislation which regulates the management of forest by the States. In same State the Act has been brought into force as it is while some of the States have enhanced their own Acts which in essence are the adopted versions of the Indian Forest Act, 1927. Since its adoption, forestry has undergone many conceptual changes leading to the new National Forest Policy, 1988. Consequently need has been felt for a revised and more comprehensive legislation which would take into account the new National Forest Policy and the emerging imperatives of conservation of Forests.

(b) to (d) Broadly speaking, the new provisions/amendments proposed include the following categories.

(1) Amendments to the existing provisions in order to make these more effective. Enhancement of penalties, modifications in settlement procedure for notification of Reserved Forests etc. would fall into this category.

(2) Incorporation of certain provisions which already exist in some of the State either by way of amendment to the Indian Forest Act, 1927 or by virtue of new Acts enacted by the States Powers given to the Forest Officers for confiscation of vehicles etc. special provisions for sandal wood and red sanders, Central on saw mills, regulation on felling of trees in rural and urban areas are some such provisions.

(3) Provisions which do not exist in any other Act but are warranted to give effect to the National Forest Policy, 1988 such as constitution of Village Forests to be managed by the community, certain exemptions to registered tree growers in respect of felling and transport of forest produce, management of forests in accordance with approved working plan exemption on land ceiling for tree plantations etc. are also proposed.